



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

needing no commendation from the reviewer and no recommendation to all who know Professor Babbitt's former volume on the *Masters of Modern French Criticism*. It is only the content of *Rousseau and Romanticism* which seems in some respects "perilous stuff," largely because the author will close his ears to the sirens' song, whether they sing of poetry and creation, or of landscapes and love. Stevenson once said that there were two principal kinds of truth, a truth for the old and a truth for the young; perhaps classicism is the better truth for critics and romanticism for those creatively inclined. Nature, *magna rerum parens*, includes every ism, together with critics and poets.

Finally it should be said that Professor Babbitt, in the course of his long argument, has uttered many wise and fair judgments. One is bound to accept much that he says about the dangers of Rousseauistic living. If the questionable judgments appear more salient in this review, that is because the author's constant habit of attack seemed to call for a serried system of defense. Curiously enough, his own statements, by reason of their thorough-going quality, have often supplied or implied the counter-irritant. A few more examples of this, partaking of the *de te fabula* variety, may be offered by way of valediction. "One can discern . . . the danger of a classicism that is too aloof from the here and now. . . ." "He was not capable of a poetic faith, not willing to suspend his disbelief on passing from the world of ordinary fact to the world of artistic creation." "Tradition and routine will be met sooner or later by the cry of Faust: *Hinaus ins Freie*."

E. PRESTON DARGAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Französische Dichter des Mittelalters: II. Marie de France. By EMIL WINKLER. *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Academie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse.* 188. Band, 3. Abhandlung. Wien, 1918. Pp. 127.

In this elaborate treatise, Emil Winkler has attempted to identify Marie de France with the Countess Marie de Champagne (1145-98). The thesis attracts by its dramatic interest: these two women stand out in high relief among twelfth-century personalities. The first ranks among the most talented of the Old French poets; the second was a leader in society and a patroness who surrounded herself with a remarkable group of writers.

In support of Winkler's contention it may be said that both Marias were of noble birth; both were interested in love-literature, one as an author (the *Lais*), the other as a patroness; both turned their attention, toward the end of their lives, to pious works (the *Espurgatoire Saint Patriz*; Evrart's translation of *Genesis*; the *Eructavit*); and both lived in the second half of the twelfth century. Winkler makes use of these generally accepted facts, but he has discovered no additional evidence.

He has attempted to show that the love treatment in Marie's *Lais* is in conformity with the views ascribed to Marie de Champagne by Andreas Capellanus in his *De amore*. But Marie de Champagne seems to have enjoyed detailed discussions of love questions, whereas the love treatment in the *Lais* is naïve: it shows no trace of a *précieux* environment such as the Countess of Champagne created.

Winkler seems to realize the weakness of his positive argument and therefore his chief effort is to combat the opposing views generally held by scholars in regard to Marie de France: that she was born in the Vexin, in the extreme west of the Isle de France, and that she lived and wrote in England, whereas it is certain that Marie de Champagne was born in Paris and lived in Champagne from the age of eighteen until her death.

Marie's statement *si sui de France* (*Fables*, *Epilogue*, l. 4) is taken to imply that she was living outside of France; there are certain Anglo-Norman traits in her language; she gives some description of Pistre, a small town in the Norman Vexin (*Dous amanz*, vss. 18 ff.), accurate enough to imply familiarity with the place; two pieces of internal evidence were advanced by Mall to indicate that Marie was living in England when she wrote the *Espurgatoire Saint Patriz*; Bédier interpreted the expression *terres de là* (*Milun*, 330) as implying that Marie was living in England when she wrote this *Lai*; several English words are used in the *Lais* and the *Fables*; Marie states that she translated the *Fables* from an English original (Marie de Champagne could hardly be expected to know English); finally, the best manuscripts of all the works of Marie de France that we have were copied in England: these are the well-known arguments advanced by scholars in the past.

Winkler attacks these arguments in order, except that he neglects the evidence afforded by the description of Pistre. But he is able to refute satisfactorily only those of Mall. He declares that Marie de France was born and lived in the heart of France because of her own statement, *si sui de France*; he believes that the poet is using her title as the daughter of the king of France. But it may be objected that a title would not be divided in this way: *Marie ai nom, si sui de France*; it is also improbable that a person writing in France would make this unnecessary statement.

Winkler states that Warnke's investigation of Marie's language leaves no doubt that she wrote in the dialect of the Isle de France. At this point he appears to move a little too swiftly: let us look more closely at the evidence obtainable. This evidence is not all to be found in Winkler's pages. Warnke himself is much less sure of the conclusion to be deduced from his study of Marie's language (*Fables*, *Bibliotheca normannica*, VI, lxxx ff. summary on p. cxi). Warnke concludes that it is very hard to determine what dialect she used; but, in agreement with Suchier (*Altfrz. Gram.*, §19), he inclines to consider Francien her native speech on account of her use of the diphthong *ou* < Latin *ō*. In addition he cites as evidence her use of the

rhyme *ueil* < *ōcūlu* : *soleil* < *solicūlu* (*Espurgatoire*, 1822). Nyrop does not admit the diphthong *ou* < *ō* (*Grammaire historique*, I³, §183) in Old French; moreover, T. A. Jenkins (*Espurgatoire Saint Patriz* [1894], pp. 22-28) has shown that Marie does not have *ou* < *ō*. In his second edition (*Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, 1903) in a note to line 1882, where *ueil* is in rhyme with *soleil*, Professor Jenkins refers to Suchier's argument based on this rhyme as unsound because the same rhyme is used by Angier (*Vie de Saint Grégoire*) who is known to have written in England. But, on the other hand, Warnke brings forward some strong indications of Anglo-Norman traits. Marie, moreover, separates the imperfect of the first conjugation from that of the second and third; *ei* has not developed to *oi*; *an*^c is kept separate from *en*^c.

Suchier and, following him, Warnke assigned Marie's birthplace to the Vexin, in the west of the Isle de France. Winkler cannot allow the matter to rest in this situation; he therefore affirms his belief that Marie wrote in the literary language of the time, referring to Suchier in Warnke's *Lais*², *Vorbemerkung*, to Groeber, *Grundriss*, I², 727, and especially to Gertrud Wacker's recent essay, *Ueber das Verhaeltnis von Dialekt und Schriftsprache im Altfranzoesischen*, 1916. If such is the case, her language would not help in determining her birthplace. This may be true; but her language may very well indicate where she lived during a large part of her life, and it may offer excellent evidence in this regard, especially if it is corroborated by other facts.

Next Winkler takes up Mall's evidence. He quite correctly discards the allusion to King Stephen because the name already stood in the Latin prose of Henry of Saltrey, which Marie translated. Line 1992 of the *Espurgatoire* states that certain monks

Vindrent a Lue en Engleterre.

This line translates the Latin "ad Ludense coenobium . . . in Angliam redierunt." In the first edition a *Lue* was printed as one word: *alué*. Mall translated: "The monks came hither to England," and thought the author had thus shown that she was living in England. Winkler prefers to translate *alué* as "at once," unaware apparently that he is fighting a phantom, for the word is simply the name of the abbey of Louth Park, as was discovered long ago by Warnke (*Literaturblatt für germ. u. rom. Phil.* [1895], col. 87).

Winkler disagrees with Bédier (*Revue des deux Mondes*, CVII, 841, note) in regard to the interpretation of line 330 of *Milun*:

De tutes les terres de la

To Bédier the words *de la* mean *de là de la mer*, indicating that Marie was in England at the time. Winkler advances the idea that the author is considering the matter from the point of view of the hero's native land, and not from that of her own residence. The probability favors Bédier. Winkler would translate: "die dortigen Laendereien," a doubtful interpretation.

There are three English words in the *Lais*: *nihtegale* (*Laustic*, 6), *gotelef* (*Chievrefoil*, 115), and *garwalf* (*Bisclavret*, 4, 9). Of the first two Winkler makes light: *gotelef*, he says, is not to be found in dictionaries and, therefore, may not be an English word. *Nihtegale* would be a single word that a French writer might have known and might have been tempted to use on account of its strangeness. He attaches more importance to *garwalf*, which Marie carefully explains; for there is a French word *garou*. It seems to Winkler that the statement

Garwalf l'apelent li Norman

and Marie's explanation have no justification for their presence in the poem unless the word *garou* had penetrated to Normandy but not to France, and that Marie was writing for the people of inner France. If that were true how could Marie de Champagne know the word?

It seems very improbable that Marie de Champagne would have used any English words. Her public would be entirely ignorant of English and any use of English on her part would have been a pedantic and silly display of knowledge. We are not justified in supposing that she knew any English words at all. If the word *gotelef* did not exist in English, the ability to translate the two parts of the word *chievrefoil* and to fabricate such a word would imply a still greater knowledge of English. *Nightingale*, *goat*, and *leaf*, to which must be added *welke* and *sepande* (in the *Fables*), are so diverse in meaning that they indicate a rather extensive knowledge of English on the part of the author.

The question as to whether there was any intermediate English version of the *Fables* is very complicated, and Winkler cannot solve it, as he himself admits, after twenty-four pages of discussion.

Winkler does not attempt to prove Marie's statement,

M'entremis de cest livre faire
E de l'Engleis en Romanz traire

a falsification. He realizes, no doubt, that Marie de Champagne could not state with very good grace that she translated from English, for she probably knew no English and the people about her would be aware of that fact. His way out of the difficulty is again by means of translation and he arrives at the following: "Ich habe uebernommen, dieses Buch zu schreiben, und es, das im Englischen vorhanden ist, damit auch dem Franzoesischen zu vermitteln," but she is to take it from the Latin. This is, of course, impossible: the second *de* goes with *traire* and indicates the place from which the matter must have been taken.

The *Espurgatoire* has these lines:

Jo, Marie, ai mis en memoire
Le livre de l'Espurgatoire:
En Romanz qu'il seit entendables
A laie gent e cuvenables.

To Winkler, these lines indicate that Marie was writing on the continent; for, he argues, there were not enough French-speaking people among the laity in England at that time to warrant the translation. He is justified, no doubt, in maintaining that Denis Pyramus' reference to Marie's *Lais* (*Vie Saint Edmunt*, cf. *Modern Philology*, XII, 351) is not evidence that Marie lived in England.

The fact that the best manuscripts of all of Marie's works were copied in England does not imply, according to Winkler, that they were written there; for the largest number were copied in France and the oldest manuscript that we have is of the middle of the thirteenth century, which leaves sufficient time for the poems to have become popular in England and to have been extensively copied.

Believing that he has shown it unnecessary to assume that Marie lived in England, Winkler states that the suggestion of J. C. Fox (*English Historical Review* [1910], pp. 303 ff., and [1911], pp. 317 ff.) that Marie was an abbess of Shaftsbury and an illegitimate daughter of Geoffrey IV Plantagenet (died 1151), father of Henry II, loses its main support and therefore falls. Undoubtedly, Fox's identification will remain a more acceptable hypothesis than that of Winkler.

Winkler believes that the evidence shows only that Marie de France was connected in some way with the court of England and indicates, therefore, that she was of noble birth. For the sake of Count William she is willing to undertake the *travail e peine*

Ki que m'en tiegne pur vilaine (Prologue to *Fables*, 36).

That is, according to Winkler, she feels that it is beneath her station to write. This reminds him of Marie de Champagne who gave Crétien de Troyes the *sans et matiere* of *Lancelot* but left to him the *painne et antencion*, that is, the menial part of the work. But G. Paris has shown (*Romania*, VIII, 39) that Marie is troubled by coarse words that she has to translate. The context favors G. Paris against Winkler. Other prologues of the time, such as those of Crétien, that of the *Roman de Thèbes* and of the *Lais*, the beginning of *Guigemar*, and the *Epilogue* to the *Fables*, these show that Marie, like other poets of the time, considered it a duty and honor to write and to use the greatest care in her work. Marie attaches great importance to her "labor" and fears lest some cleric may claim it as his own.

Winkler adds an extensive but unconvincing and somewhat irrelevant discussion of the origin of the *Lais*. In this, he has devoted undue space to elements in the problem which are beyond his powers or which are of no positive value to him; as, for example, the long discussions of the immediate source of Marie's *Fables*, of English words, and of the origin of the *Lais*. Not only is Winkler's study hopelessly weak on the positive side, but he has failed to give due weight to contradictory evidence. He has neglected to put together all the allusions to the two Maries. If he had done so, he would have found that Crétien de Troyes (*Lancelot*), Gautier d'Arras

(*Eracle*), Conon de Béthune and Aubouin de Sézanne, Andreas Capellanus (*De amore*), Richard of England (in a poem written from his prison in Germany), and Evrart (translation of *Genesis*) designate Marie de Champagne as Countess, and four call her Countess of Champagne; *Eructavit* contains a dedication to Marie, who is addressed as *ma dame de Champagne*, while Aubouin de Sézanne calls her Countess of Brie. On the other hand, Marie de France is mentioned by Denis Pyramus in his *Life of Saint Edmond* as *dame Marie* simply (*Modern Philology*, XII, 351). Here we are told of the great success of her *Lais* in court circles; but in the seven references to Marie de Champagne there is no suggestion of any literary talent that she may have possessed, no reference to any work of hers except the single letter ascribed to her by Andreas Capellanus. If Marie de Champagne had written poems showing even mediocre talent they would, undoubtedly, have been lauded by a dozen poets.

The chronology of the period is difficult to determine and there is still considerable divergence of opinion among scholars. This fact leaves Winkler's hypothesis rather hazy in spots. He is of the opinion that both Crétien de Troyes, in *Erec*, and Gautier d'Arras, in *Ille et Galeron*, were influenced by his "Marie." *Ille et Galeron* was written in 1167, when Marie de Champagne was only nineteen years old. Could she have been sufficiently mature at that age to have already written the *Lais*? The date of *Erec* is not fixed, but there is a tendency among scholars, recently, to date it earlier still. It may be found that the date of *Erec* is not very far from 1155, the date when Wace's *Brut* was completed, for *Erec* and the *Brut* have some similarities: in that year Marie de Champagne was ten years old.

The whole study seems to me a failure. It is an unfortunate attempt to force a conclusion, with insufficient evidence in its favor, by means of an arbitrary and unsound method.

FOSTER E. GUYER

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE